



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/531,633	03/21/2000	Zhe Li		6773

7590 02/10/2004
Zhe Li
1 Argent Drive
Poughkeepsie, NY 12603

EXAMINER

GARCIA OTERO, EDUARDO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

9

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Regarding 09/531,633 Written Request for Interview.

Applicant has filed a written Interview Request form received 1/30/04, requesting an interview to discuss the use of Okuzawa in 35 USC 103 rejections. Applicant broadly states "I do not understand... Okuzawa".

The Examiner has reviewed the application file, and the record is clear.

Applicant's proposed After Final amendment was received 1/8/04, was not entered, and the issues raised were discussed in detail in an Advisory Action mailed 1/22/04, specifically in the Advisory Action sections (1) through (5), which correspond identically to the issues raised by Applicant in the Applicant Remarks section of said After Final amendment received 1/8/04.

Applicant's request for an interview does not raise any new issues that have not been discussed clearly in the record.

Therefore, Applicant's written request for an interview is denied.

Applicant's previous telephonic request on 1/27/04 for an interview was previously verbally denied.

Further, on 2/5/04 Applicant left a telephone message for the Examiner requesting an interview. The Examiner returned the phone call on the same day, and stated that the written request for interview had been reviewed, would be denied in writing, and would be promptly mailed.

* * *


KEVIN J. TESKA
SUPERVISORY
PATENT EXAMINER